

Interview Summary

Application No.
09/202,244

Applicant(s)
Breunig et al.

Examiner
Margaret Glass Moore

Group Art Unit
1712

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Margaret Glass Moore

(3) _____

(2) Iurie Schwartz

(4) _____

Date of Interview Jan 4, 2001

Type: ☐ Telephonic ☒ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☒ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☒ was reached. ☐ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: all pending

Identification of prior art discussed:
Jachmann et al., Koshar et al.

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:
It was discussed that eliminating platinum on charcoal from process claims would overcome Jachmann et al. as an anticipatory reference. The Examiner indicated that eliminating the alcohol reactant from the process claims would lead to a new ground of rejection under 35 USC 103, for instance, a combination of Koshar et al. and Jachmann et al. In addition, the elimination of the platinum on charcoal catalyst (noted supra) would also raise the possibility of a new grounds for rejection. The Examiner suggested combining such an amendment with a Declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 indicating the criticality and unexpected improvements using a heterogeneous catalyst as claimed. The Examiner noted that any novelty found in any process claim would not necessarily result in novelty in the product claims. She also noted that process claim 20 is not limited to any particular reactant (i.e. the synthon of claim 1)

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.